



# South Mountain Corridor Study

## Citizens Advisory Team

### Meeting Summary

**Date:** February 2, 2006  
**Time:** 5:30 p.m.  
**Location:** District 6 Komatke Center, Learning Center Meeting Hall

#### CAT Members Attending:

Rock Argabright, Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce  
 Laurel Arndt, Ahwatukee Foothills Village Planning Committee  
 Kris Black, Ahwatukee Foothills HOA  
 Steve Boschen, Valley Forward  
 Jim Buster, Avondale  
 Clayton Danzeisen, Maricopa County Farm Bureau  
 Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning Committee  
 Doris French, Laveen Village Planning Committee  
 Michael Goodman, Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council

Don Jones, Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce  
 David Lafferty, Tolleson  
 Bob Moss, United Dairymen of Arizona  
 Nathaniel Percharo, I-10 Pecos Landowners  
 Laurie Prendergast, Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development  
 Michelle Pulich-Stewart, Sierra Club  
 John D. Rodriguez, Lakewood HOA  
 Jim Strogen, Kyrene de los Lagos Elementary School  
 Dave Williams, Knight Transportation/AMTA

#### Staff and Consultants:

Jack Allen, HDR  
 Matt Burdick, ADOT  
 Mike Bruder, ADOT  
 Kelly Cairo, GCI  
 Chris Clary-Lemon, HDR

Ken Davis, FHWA  
 Amy Edwards, HDR  
 Ralph Ellis, ADOT  
 Theresa Gunn, GCI  
 Connie Heitz, HDR

Bob Hazlett, MAG  
 Don Herp, COP  
 Dan Lance, ADOT  
 Roger Roy, MAG  
 Bill Vachon, FHWA

#### Citizens:

Norm Dahle  
 Keith Dzuriga  
 William Eastburn  
 David Fultz  
 Amy Johnson  
 Boyd Johnson

Jim Jochim  
 Larry Lee  
 Matthew Alan Lord  
 Jacob Lundquist  
 Andrew Marwick  
 Doug Murphy

Melanie Pai  
 Lisa Percharo  
 Lorena Peszz  
 Corinne Purtill  
 William Richardson  
 Dave Swisher

#### ACTION PLAN

| Task/Activity  | Who         | When  |
|--|-------------|---|
| Provide an answer to: ...CO <sub>2</sub> must be addressed regionally. Why don't you reveal EPA requirements?  | Amy Edwards | February 23 CAT meeting, air quality presentation |
| Review this with technical people: Is there a required release rate (flow, gpm) over area when directing rainwater, runoff to lower area? If there is, what is this rate and what engineering principles are used to control this rate.  | Amy Edwards | February 23 or March 2 CAT meeting                |
| Provide an answer to: ... PM <sub>10</sub> being measured and possible being reduced in future air data along with being included in proposed S Mt Loop 202. Aren't PM <sub>2.5</sub> reading to be included in the EIS? Also, why wasn't there a discussion on PM <sub>2.5</sub> with projects on same? | Amy Edwards | February 23 CAT meeting, air quality presentation |

|   |             |   |
|---|-------------|---|
| Provide an answer to: ... Is there current air quality monitor data at the school located in the northeast quadrant of the SR51/202L interchange? Would there be pre and post freeway data available? | Amy Edwards | February 23 CAT meeting, air quality presentation |
| Check on the area near 59 <sup>th</sup> Avenue and Baseline regarding Section 4(f) issues. Properties appear on graphics but not in listings.   | Amy Edwards | February 23 CAT meeting                           |
| Provide economic totals for each alignment.   | Amy Edwards | February 23 or March 2 CAT meeting                |
| Review the noise information for the west side alternatives provided to the CAT.  | Amy Edwards | February 23 or March 2 CAT meeting                |
| Update all business employee numbers. A lot has changed since October 2005.   | HDR         |   |
| If 101WPR takes out "Recker" and 101WFR does not, why does the number of employees lost only change by three?   | HDR         |   |
| What is W55 tax revenues north of (Gila) river vs. south of river?  | HDR         |   |

## **Welcome**

Theresa Gunn welcomed attendees and encouraged members of the public to review the Citizen Advisory Team handout, which includes a question and comment form on the back. She asked CAT members if they would like any of the questions from the public as received at the January 19, 2006 meeting added to the agenda. Five questions were noted, and questions and answers can be found in the Project Update section of this summary.

## **Project Update**

Matt Burdick named the reports that remain to be reviewed by the CAT. He asked the members how many meetings they would like to hold to review the reports and what dates they would like to meet. There was consensus that meetings would be held on February 23, at which the air quality report will be reviewed; March 2; and, March 30, at which the CAT evaluation will occur.

### ***CAT Member Questions and Comments:***

**Question:** What is meant by "local access?" **Response:** Access to I-10, in this case, on the west side.

**Question:** What about questions about the evaluation process itself? **Response:** We can discuss this today during the evaluation criteria agenda item.

Michelle Pulich-Stewart commented that it was unacceptable to the Sierra Club to allow the public to attend meetings, yet be unable to participate. She explained that the Sierra Club cannot participate in a process that does not allow public process and asked the team to reconsider the public comment policy.

Gunn asked the group if they wished to reconsider how they accept public comment. After discussion, the group consensus was to not change the existing public comment policy of accepting public questions, distributing the questions to the SMCAT and responding to questions as requested at the next meeting. Three members of the group expressed their desire to have more opportunity for public comment at SMCAT meetings. Pulich-Stewart said that she will take this response back to the Sierra Club.

### **Public Question Responses**

Amy Edwards and Matt Burdick answered public questions that the CAT requested to be added to the agenda.

**(From Brian Smith, question #2):** Are you saying there is no significant movement of species between So. Mountain and the Estrella Mts? **Response:** There are no migration corridors, but there are movements of wildlife.

**(From Greta Rogers, question #1):** Will the meetings (future) be publicly noticed and open to all, including the one with Gov. Wm. Rhodes, GRIC? **Response:** Public meetings are posted. Staff and other internal meetings are not open to the public.

**(From Greta Rogers, question #3):** “Impossible to measure ozone” in project corridor; can measure CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from vehicles at locations chosen and CO<sub>2</sub> must be addressed regionally.” Why don’t you reveal EPA requirements – They’re known and established and Phoenix area on notice for compliance of P. 10 by end of 2006 and now due to exceedence of compliance and impossible goal to attain (notice to ADEQ by EPA 12/05). **Response:** We will provide an answer to this question during the air quality presentation.

**(From David Fultz, Concerned Families Along S Mt Loop 202, question #2):** Is there a required release rate (flow, gpm) over area when directing rainwater, runoff to lower area? If there is, what is this rate and what engineering principles are used to control this rate. **Response:** I will need to review this with our technical people.

**(From David Fultz, Concerned Families Along S Mt Loop 202, question #6):** I have heard mention of Particulate Matter 10 being measured and possible being reduced in future air data along with being included in proposed S Mt Loop 202. Aren’t PM<sub>2.5</sub> reading to be included in the EIS? Also, why wasn’t there a discussion on PM<sub>2.5</sub> with projects on same? **Response:** We will provide an answer to this question during the air quality presentation.

Edwards also answered CAT member questions presented at the January 19, 2006 meeting.

**Question:** Is there current air quality monitor data at the school located in the northeast quadrant of the SR51/202L interchange? Would there be pre and post freeway data available? **Response:** We will look into this issue and provide more information during the air quality presentation.

**Question:** Verify whether the SRP sub-station planned for the 57<sup>th</sup>-58<sup>th</sup> Ave./Baseline area is on the utilities map. **Response:** We are following up with SRP.

**Question:** What is the cost estimate to depress at Dobbins completely? **Response:** We are looking at these costs. The primary cost difference is related to drainage issues and is likely about \$4 million.

### **Section 4(f) Report**

Edwards introduced Jack Allen and Connie Heitz, HDR, who addressed technical questions related to the Section 4(f) and Economics reports, respectively. Edwards reviewed the Section 4(f) Report, explaining that some Section 4(f) properties are also Section 6(f) properties, based on the funding source. While there are Section 6(f) properties located within the study area, none are affected by current project alignments. Each property is detailed in the full report. This information becomes part of the draft EIS.

### **CAT Member Questions and Comments:**

**Question:** What is meant by “proximity?” **Response:** Proximity has to do with access, noise, visual

integrity, and so forth. We usually look at an area of about ¼-mile. We have shifted alignments to avoid all direct impacts to west side Section 4(f) properties that were known. However, we have discovered two additional potential Section 4(f) properties that are part of the W71 Alternative – which will now shift. This is due to a school district that had indicated that an area would be fenced and gated. Because they no longer plan to do so, the area is potentially a Section 4(f) property. Additionally an adjacent park has now changed ownership from a developer to the City of Phoenix.

**Question:** If they add a fence later, it will not be Section 4(f)? **Response:** Yes.

**Question:** What about the area near 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Baseline? They appear on the map but are not listed in the figure. **Response:** We will check on this and get back to you.

**Question:** What happens with the Estrella District Park Complex? **Response:** There are many uses in this area and it is not considered part of Section 4(f). Properties of this nature are considered on a case-by-case basis with FHWA. Additional information can be found in the Social Conditions Report.

**Question:** I see a lot of areas where, due to avoiding Section 4(f) areas, the alignment has been impinged upon. How does this affect the functionality of a freeway? **Response:** Adjustments have to be examined to make sure they are prudent. All freeway design is maintained above minimum standards.

**Question:** At what point can a Section 4(f) property pop up and it would be too late to account for it? **Response:** After the Record of Decision, if an area was to be changed in some way that would create a Section 4(f) property, that property would need to work around freeway plans.

**Question:** What happens if there are trails that are planned, but not built? **Response:** Trails that are planned and adopted are considered as existing trails.

**Question:** The western segment of Sun Circle Trail appears lost. **Response:** Only the area the crosses the alignment is shown.

## **Economics Report**

Edwards reviewed the Economics Report. She noted that the Potential Displacements table should be updated to show an additional 350 employees for each of the four rows that include W101C and W101E options. Total tax revenue is based on existing and future land use.

### ***CAT Member Questions and Comments:***

**Question:** The numbers in this report don't include businesses that might lose access, correct?

**Response:** Correct. The report includes businesses that would be acquired and those employees that would be considered displaced.

**Question:** Does the report include planned business? How often are the figures updated? **Response:** The information comes from two databases. Data is from early 2005, with a supplemental land use review in October of 2005.

**Question:** Don't you have to weigh the difference between moving a small vs. large business?

**Response:** This is reflected in the cost of relocation. These figures were not part of the Cost Report. Real estate costs will be included in the update to that report.

**Comment:** One thing that doesn't show up is the economic value to the region.

**Question:** I don't see the numbers for Tolleson sales tax removed based on the percentage for the city. **Response:** Yes, we are updating the report to include this information.

**Question:** I would like to see the totals of each alignment. **Response:** We will provide this information.

**Question:** In Table 2, where did the City of Phoenix figures come from? **Response:** This information is derived from a sampling of properties in Maricopa County and land use information.

**Question:** Can you verify that the three mile strip in Laveen is not going anywhere, regardless of what occurs? Also, it is important to note that rezoning in Phoenix will occur quickly. **Response:** We use existing and future planned land use. **Reply:** Zoning is in place in Laveen. If a freeway doesn't come through, there would still be commercial, and the \$19 million potential would not be lost.

**Comment:** Given that the general plan may as well be useless in Phoenix, we don't know what changes a city might make to compensate for changes.

**Question:** It would be interesting to know if some businesses could relocate within a city. **Response:** We can't anticipate these types of possibilities at this level of the analysis.

**Question:** Do we have information about the area north vs. south of the Salt River? **Response:** We could probably get this.

**Comment:** Sometimes a freeway spawns growth at grade, but not when it is raised.

**Question:** Two years ago we discussed other lanes that would be added. I don't see these on any map. I also don't see how the four hotels would not be impacted at 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue and I-10. **Response:** All of the lanes fit within the existing right-of-way. Detailed maps of local access will be discussed at the late-February meeting.

**Question:** What about businesses that have said there is no suitable location to relocate, such as the tank farm? **Response:** We are working with the owner and the City of Phoenix on this issue.

**Question:** Do we look at whether a business could relocate in the region, or in the state? **Response:** The Technical Report addresses those that might have more difficulty relocating. **Reply:** It would be sad if a business took its \$3.4 million in Arizona money and relocated out of state.

**Question:** Would ADOT build additional railroad spurs if a displaced business required access to a spur? **Response:** ADOT would work with the displaced owner to find a suitable site; however, ADOT does not build spurs.

## **W101 Options**

Edwards reviewed the W101 Options Memo. She explained that the project team reviewed the four 101 options to determine if all four should continue to be studied in the EIS and whether there was enough information available to eliminate any option. The team removed the W101W99 option and may eliminate others.

### ***CAT Member Questions and Comments:***

**Question:** How does this affect the evaluation? **Response:** The CAT will need to decide if they want to evaluate 101 as a whole, or evaluate each option.

**Question:** What about the problem of more employees in an area than currently shown? **Response:** These figures, and others, will continue to be updated through the publishing date of the draft EIS.

**Comment:** I have heard that the City of Phoenix is opposed to any option other than W55. **Response:** (Don Herp, City of Phoenix) There was a council resolution to support W55 in December of 2003, or very near that time.

## **SMCAT Evaluation Process**

Gunn explained the methodology of the evaluation process. First, the CAT will rate the importance of one criterion against another. Pairs are randomly generated, and all pairs are compared against each other. This process determines the weight of each criteria. Then, CAT members will rate how each criteria is satisfied by each alignment.

After discussion, the group developed the following criteria statements. An updated version of the evaluation criteria will be provided at the next meeting. The group agreed to establish an air quality criterion after reviewing the Air Quality Report. Additionally, discussion will continue on the design criterion regarding total functionality at all levels, whether the design meets the purpose and need regionally, and traffic operations. A design statement under consideration was: *The design will improve the functionality of the regional freeway system.*

**Ecological:**

*Does not disrupt wildlife habitat and connectivity, native vegetation, or natural water flow.*

**Visual:**

*The freeway and its traffic is not visible from grade, any visible component of the concrete structure is mitigated through landscape and architectural design.*

**Community Cohesion:**

*The selected alternative provides the necessary regional transportation capacity while providing the needed safe community connectivity at appropriate locations, and does not create a physical, psychological, or economic barrier.*

**Displacement:**

*Freeway alignment will disrupt or displace the minimum number of homes, businesses, schools, and parks.*

**CAT Member Questions and Comments:**

**Question:** Is rubberized asphalt assumed? **Response:** Yes.

**Question:** Are auxiliary lanes an ADOT standard? **Response:** They are part of current designs.

**Comment:** We don't have design documents about the elevations to understand how obtrusive a freeway would be.

**Comment:** We should make sure that our statements aren't duplicated among the various criteria.

**Comment:** My concern in designing a freeway is to avoid creating additional Broadway Curve scenarios.

**Written Comments/Questions Submitted by the Public:**

Comments and questions received during the meeting are recorded here verbatim from forms received.

**Larry Lee, citizen concerns**

1. Have NEPA and SEPA concerns been addressed? How has the pollution data evolved in the past 20 to 25 years since this freeway was originally proposed? What health issues have evolved or changed in the last 20 to 25 years that could affect the EIS?

2. What study has ADOT performed regarding traffic issues on surface streets when highway closures occur?

3. Since ADOT has been made aware of the connector between the proposed Loop 202 and the Canamex Highway, how does that connector impact the EIS and the communities involved?

4. As it pertains to noise...has the SMCAT been educated on scientific methods for evaluating noise pollution? Does the SMCAT know what the decibel numbers actually represent such as a hearing test? –Comparison test, wave carry tests at distances and elevations, etc...?

5. Has there been a study regarding numbers of drunk drivers associated with casino locations?

**William Richardson**

I've seen constructions costs ranging from \$900 million to \$1.3 billion, but this does not include 1) additional purchase of right-of-way land, 2) relocation costs of displaced businesses and residences, and 3) relocation of utilities. Can ADOT provide some guidance on total estimated costs using an historical relationship of construction costs to total costs? For example, if in similar projects construction costs were 50% of the total cost, then the projected total cost for South Mountain Freeway would be in the \$1.8 to \$2.6 billion.

**David Fultz, Concerned Families Along South Mountain Loop 202**

1. This question is in regard to comment on public question. To allow public questions to be read out loud just stay true to your schedule and reserve 15-30 minutes for these questions to be read. If the schedule states the last 30 minutes, 8:30-9:00, are for questions, then stop the meeting and read the questions. If there is still time left then continue with the meeting or adjourn.

2. You were discussing changes to W71 and how this property wasn't considered 4(f) because there were plans to put a gate around the land with a lock around the entrance gate. What specific reason changes the 4(f) status when the above process happens (gates and locks)?

3. I have heard that as South Mountain Loop passes through South Mountain Park it will cut into the national hiking trail on the west side of South Mountain Park. If this trail is in fact taken to build this highway, will anything be done to reroute it?

4. What governing body or person will make the decision if South Mountain Loop 202 becomes a hazardous cargo route? Is this covered on the EIS?

5. If some of the SMCAT members do not agree with any of the three alignments on the west side of South Mountain Loop 202 will they be allowed to vote no-build?

6. Will there be a direct up or down vote on the three alignments from the SMCAT or will the evaluation scoring criteria be used to select the alignment?

7. With the weighted criteria used during the evaluation process wouldn't a person have to make all of his scores weighted as not to lesson the value of his vote/score.

**CAT Member Comment Cards**

Statements shown below are recorded verbatim from comment cards.

- We need to cover induced traffic and induced growth. Bill Vachon said in July we would discuss it. Where will it show up?
- Update all business employee numbers. A lot has changed since October 2005.
- If 101WPR takes out "Recker" and 101WFR does not, why does the number of employees lost only change by three?
- What is W55 tax revenues north of (Gila) river vs. south of river?

**Adjourn:**

The next CAT meeting will be held Thursday, February 23, 2006 at 5:30 p.m. at the Learning Center Meeting Hall, Komatke Center, in District Six.